

**CITIZENS' REVENUE REVIEW AND ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS
COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES FOR
Thursday October 7, 2010, AT 5:30 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
202 C STREET, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

**For information, contact Breanna Zwart, Council District Four
202 C Street, 3rd Floor, San Diego, CA 92101
Email: bzwart@sandiego.gov 619-236-7180**

Meeting was called to order at 5:36 PM

Commissioners Present: Moser, Morton, Gin, Singh, Nelson

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

COMMISSIONER COMMENT

CITY ATTORNEY, IBA, CITY AUDITOR COMMENT

ADOPTION AGENDA

Approval of the Record of Action Items for September 23, 2010

- Dr. Singh motioned to approve the Record of Actions for September 23, 2010, Seconded by Ms. Moser.
- All present voted in favor of approval.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM-1 Presentation of Small Business in San Diego from the Office of Councilmember Carl DeMaio

“Open for Business: Action Plan to make San Diego the Most Friendly City in America for Small Business” from the Office of Councilmember Carl DeMaio was provided, without presentation.

ITEM-2 Discussion/Approval of Draft Report Sections

General Comments

- Mr. Moser
 - Formatting should be done in a way that makes it easier to digest the information.
 - The differences between a task force and a commission should be explained.

- Definitions of terms are needed (e.g. infrastructure, competitiveness, etc.).
 - Report is currently structured as a narrative, and needs a more basic outline.
 - Objective sources should be utilized for citations on San Diego economy (SANDAG, etc).
 - While the report may not reflect all views, it can hopefully reflect a general consensus on the commission's recommendations.
- Dr. Singh
 - Suggested a more simple approach to the report.
 - Brief introduction
 - Include who the commission talked to and what facts were learned.
 - Based on the commission's mandate, conclusions that were drawn.
 - If there is not unanimous agreement on something, the split should be described (e.g. 6 supported, 1 who did not), any conclusions (or things to watch for) expressed, etc.
 - Narrowly define what "quality of life" means for San Diego.
 - Give evidence to the City Council of available options, but also state the fundamental items the commission agrees upon.
 - More positive outlook might be helpful.
 - Effects of wealth disparities may need to be addressed, and possibility that survey did not reflect some of the more poor communities' concerns.
- Mr. Nelson
 - Once the substance of the report is complete, then a summary (as Singh described) can be done.
 - Believes quality of life should be the driving focus.
 - Discussed city's pension benefit plans. The pension plan is similar to most cities, but the money was spent on other things instead of being put away.
 - Tax levels of Fresno and Santa Ana bring averages down, because they lack large hospitality and tourism industries, and have lower inland property values.
- Mr. Morton
 - Citizens are inherently not interested in increasing fees/taxes.
 - If measures are earmarked, people are more willing to pay.
 - Greater efficiencies should be implemented across the board.
 - Compared experiences between city and county levels of efficiency.
- Dr. Gin
 - Reiterated the commission's limited charge of only revenue and competitiveness.
 - Admitted the commission's restricted task is problematic, because the expenditure side is not available.

Comments Specific to Revenue Section

- Mr. Nelson
 - Budget gap is not a temporary problem.

- Dr. Singh
 - Report can make recommendations to not decrease police/fire.
 - Residents generally feel safe and would like to keep safety services at same levels.
 - If every issue the commission covered is detailed, it becomes overwhelming. Thus, the most prominent issues should be highlighted.
 - Managed competition discussion is already occurring, so we shouldn't spend a lot of time on it.
- Mr. Morton
 - Permit process was covered well.
 - Distinguish solutions, which can be dealt with internally, from those requiring a vote of the citizens.
- IBA Representative
 - Focus on fees is a large conclusion and needs to be reviewed.
 - Tax would be a five-year temporary measure, so significant reforms also need to be made as well.
- Gin
 - Suggested rankings of revenue options.
 - Easy to narrow down revenue, but there is lots of detail in competitiveness discussion.
 - Recommendations affecting only specific industries, as opposed to other more broad suggestions, should be separated.
 - Summary of survey data should be moved to the beginning of the report, before competitiveness & revenue.
- Moser
 - Section on workforce development needs more specific terms. Information on community development block grants should be researched.
 - Need to ensure each portion in the report is necessary.
 - Not sure wireless Internet availability should be considered a main issue.
 - Each recommendation must be supported with information regarding practical ability for city to take action.
 - Report could be shorter.
 - Presentation information should be included in the appendix.

-
- Before next meeting, everyone should work on personal rankings of both revenue and competitiveness strategies.

- Next meeting is October 21st.

Chair Bob Nelson adjourned the meeting at 7:19 PM

Bob Nelson
Chair